

OCT 04 2001

8 MARTA ADAMS: Thank you.

9 My name is Marta Adams, spelled M-a-r-t-a,
10 last name Adams. I'm a Senior Deputy Attorney General
11 with the Nevada Attorney General's office. Please note
12 for the record that the Attorney General's office has
13 already submitted formal comments at the Department of
14 Energy's Yucca Mountain hearing on September 5, 2001 in
15 Las Vegas which are part of the administrative record.

1... 16 For purposes of this hearing, I am appearing
17 to register another protest to this premature proceeding
18 which was not even announced to the public until last
19 Friday, September 28, 2001.]

20 I would also like to emphasize that the
21 public notice itself did not appear in the Federal
1 end 22 Register until Monday of this week. [Three days is hardly
23 sufficient notice for citizens to appear,] much less to
24 address a subject as complex as the proposed nuclear
25 waste repository at Yucca Mountain.

5

1 The Department of Energy is, again, elevating
2 form over substance and is conducting field hearings
3 throughout Nevada with wholly inadequate notice to the
4 public and before key documents have been produced which

5 would enable meaningful public input into a decision
6 which could dramatically affect all Nevadans.

7 Not only was public notice of the field
8 hearings inadequate, but the hearings themselves are
9 occurring prematurely and outside the sequence of events

2 10 mandated by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. [DOE has not
11 issued its final Environmental Impact Statement for Yucca
12 Mountain, nor has it finalized its siting guidelines for
13 the repository.]

3 14 [Without these key documents in final form,
15 the public simply cannot meaningfully assess the
16 environmental effects of the largest public works project
17 in human history.] Ironically, the State of Nevada cannot
18 initiate legal challenges to either the EIS or the siting
19 guidelines until they are final. The Attorney General's
20 office will challenge these documents at the appropriate
21 time as it continues to hone its arguments against the
22 Yucca Mountain project.

23 Because DOE has not yet finalized its EIS or
24 its siting guidelines, it is reasonable to assume that

4 25 [DOE is conducting these sham public hearings to convey to

6

1 the public the impression that the Yucca Mountain

2 repository is an inevitability. Nothing could be further
5 3 from the truth. The many serious flaws in the project
4 are becoming increasingly evident as the State reviews
5 the various preliminary documents issued by DOE.

6 With the recent terrorist attacks in our
6 7 country, it is obvious that transportation of deadly
8 nuclear waste over an unprecedented 30-year
9 transportation campaign from secure sites that are
10 verified to be secure by the Nuclear Regulatory
11 Commission for 100 to 150 years presents this nation with
12 unacceptable risks.

7 13 As the DOE moves forward toward its probable
14 site recommendation, the State of Nevada stands ready to
15 oppose this project at every conceivable juncture.

16 Thank you.